

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-22 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 6, 11, 16, 21 and 22 have been amended. No new matter has been added by this amendment. The Examiner is thanked for indicating that all claims other than claim 11 are allowed or contain allowable subject matter and would be allowed if rewritten in independent form.

Initially the office action objects to the Specification as requiring deleting hyperlinks on pages 23-26. These hyperlinks have been deleted. Further, the original title has been deleted and replaced with a new title “A RESILIENT PACKET RING NETWORK FOR REALIZING MAC BRIDGING”. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

The office action objects to Claims 1, 6, 16, 21 and 22 for certain informalities. These claims are amended to clarify that the station node(s) are located in one or more ringlets and differ from a station located in the outside of the ringlets. Further, claim 1 is amended to clarify that “each of the station nodes transmits, in the case of transmitting a MAC frame to a station accommodated to a bridge node and located in the outside of the ringlets, a RPR MAC frame into which the MAC frame is encapsulated in such a state that the bridge node can capture the MAC frame”. Withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

On the merits, independent claim 11 is rejected under U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over “802.17 Frame Structure and Bridging Ad-Hoc Support” by Mare Holness et al, hereinafter referred to as Holness, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,349,583 to Christensen.

The office action, on page 3, alleges that “Holness implicitly discloses nodes (a station node) located in the outside of the ringlets transmitting and receiving...(slide 11)”.

Claim 11 as amended recites that “a station node located, together with a plurality of bridge nodes forwarding a media access control (MAC) frame, in one or more ringlets

constructing a resilient packet ring (RPR) network”. It is respectfully submitted that the relied upon portions of the cited references Holness and Christensen do not teach the foregoing feature of Claim 11, as amended.

Accordingly, independent claim 11 patentably distinguish over Holness in view of Christensen is allowable. Claims 12-15 that depend from the allowable Claim 11 and are allowable therewith. Further, Claims 1-10 and 16-22, which have all been indicated to contain allowable subject matter have been amended herein to address the objections raised by the office action and are allowable.

In view of the remarks set forth above, this application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested. However, if for any reason the Examiner should consider this application not to be in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned attorney at the number of listed below prior to issuing a further Action.

Any fee due with this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-1290.

Respectfully submitted,

/Nathan Weber/  
Nathan Weber  
Reg. No. 50,958

**CUSTOMER NUMBER 026304**

Telephone: (212) 940-8564  
Fax: (212) 940-8986  
Docket No.: FUJY 20.954(100794-00557)  
NDW:cc